

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2
App. Ser. No.: 09/922,463

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 12-20 have been amended and Claims 2, 8, 10, and 11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Currently, therefore, claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 12-20 remain pending in the present application, of which, claims 1, 6 and 20 are independent.

No new matter has been introduced by way of the forgoing amendments; entry thereof is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (6,515,988) in view of Ryu et al. (6,775,291).

The above claim rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The test for determining if a claim is rendered obvious by one or more references for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is set forth in MPEP § 706.02(j):

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2

App. Scr. No.: 09/922,463

Therefore, if the above-identified criteria are not met, then the cited reference(s) fails to render obvious the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited reference(s).

Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (6,515,988) in view of Ryu et al. (6,775,291).

Claim 1

The Office Action cited Eldridge et al. to show tokens, which were interpreted as the claimed network path bookmark information, and FIG. 5 of Eldridge et al. to show a process in which the tokens are transmitted to a server computer, to which a mobile device (PDA 2) is connected.

Eldridge et al. is concerned with the distribution of tokens from one person to another (see FIG. 4 and Abstract) and to a network-connected computer for printing (see FIG. 5, Abstract), where the token distribution is initiated by the sender (see FIGs. 4 and 5) and implemented using "conventional web browser software providing cross-platform communication and document transfer over the internet" (see ll. 1-20, col. 5, as cited in the Office Action). Each token contains "information necessary to find the document or service." (ll. 26-32, col. 2, as cited in the Office Action) and "to initiate actions which produce the desired result." (l. 65, col. 5 to l. 2, col. 6). Thus, each token contains an identification of a document or service, where the identification of a document can be a web address, or URL (see Abstract and ll. 9+, col. 8). However, Eldridge et al. provides no explanation as to the web address being a user-selected bookmark address stored in a browser application on a client computer. In addition, Eldridge et al. fails to disclose that

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2

App. Scr. No.: 09/922,463

such web address information is transferred from a client computer to a server computer and onwards to a mobile device upon a request by the mobile device.

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites "network path bookmark information that is stored in a browser application installed in the client computer," where the network path bookmark information comprises a "user-selected bookmark address for quick retrieval." Support for the amendment is found in the specification at at least p. 1, lines 16+ and p. 6, ll. 13+. Furthermore, as claimed, the network path bookmark information is received by a server computer from a client computer, and a bookmark name corresponding to the user-selected bookmark address in the network path bookmark information is transmitted from the server computer to the mobile device, upon a request from the mobile device, to allow the mobile device "access to the network path bookmark information." Accordingly,

a) mere disclosure in Eldridge et al. that tokens include URL information does not amount to the claimed "network path bookmark information" that comprises "user-selected bookmark address for quick retrieval"; and

b) mere disclosure in Eldridge et al. that tokens can be transferred between people and to a networked-computer using conventional web browser software does not amount to the specific claim language of receiving, by the server computer, the network path bookmark information, "that is stored in a browser application installed in the client computer", and transmitting a bookmark name to the mobile device upon "a request ... from the mobile device" to allow the mobile device access to the network path bookmark information.

The Office Action further cited Ryu et al. to supplement Eldridge et al. and show "repeatedly in a predefined time interval from a predetermined directory, ... requests a bookmark name corresponding to the bookmark address." It is respectfully submitted that Ryu et al. is concerned with a wireless internet server method in a gateway system 40 (FIG.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2

App. Ser. No.: 09/922,463

3) that "stores and manages the latest URL web contents in a URL memory using a TTL [or Time To Live], expire time and last modification time of URL web contents to inform a subscriber when bookmarked URL information defined by the subscriber is changed" (see ll. 58-64, col. 2, as cited in the Office Action).

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites "receiving at a server computer in a predetermined time interval ... the network path bookmark information from a client computer." Accordingly, mere disclosure in Ryu et al. that there is some sort of a predefined time interval for updating the URL web contents (in a gateway system based on the TTL, expire time, and last modification time of the URLs) does not amount to the claimed "predetermined time interval" in which the server computer repeatedly receives the network path bookmark information from a client computer.

The proposed modification of Eldridge et al. based upon the disclosure contained in Ryu et al. would therefore still fail to disclose all of the features claimed in amended claim 1.

Because Eldridge et al. and Ryu et al. neither teach nor suggest all the features recited in amended claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-5 and 7 and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Claim 6 has been amended to become an independent claim that recites: a) "receiving a request from the mobile device for access to the network path bookmark information;" and b) "receiving a request from the mobile device for access to the network path bookmark information, wherein the network path bookmark information is stored in a browser application installed in the client computer and comprises a user-select bookmark address for quick retrieval." Thus, as stated above with regard to claim 1,

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2

App. Ser. No.: 09/922,463

a) mere disclosure in Eldridge et al. that tokens include URL information does not amount to the claimed "network path bookmark information" that comprises "user-select bookmark address for quick retrieval"; and

b) mere disclosure in Eldridge et al. that tokens can be transferred between people and to a networked-computer using conventional web browser software does not amount to the specific claim language of receiving by the server computer the network path bookmark information, "that is stored in a browser application installed in the client computer", and transmitting a bookmark name to the mobile device upon "a request ... from the mobile device" to allow the mobile device access to the network path bookmark information.

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Eldridge et al. and Ryu et al. neither teach nor suggest all of the features recited in amended claim 6. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 12-19

Claim 9 has been amended to become dependent upon allowable claim 1; therefore, claim 9 and claims 12-19 that depend thereon are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies upon claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 12-19 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 20

Claim 20 has been amended to recite,

a client computer having stored network path bookmark information comprising at least one user-select bookmark address being stored ... in the client computer for quick retrieval in a browser application, and comprising means for determining the network path bookmark information from the predetermined directory repeatedly in a predefined time interval;

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2

App. Ser. No.: 09/922,463

a server computer ... adapted to receive the determined network path bookmark information from the client computer;

a mobile device ... adapted to request a bookmark name corresponding to the bookmark address from the server computer.

Thus, as stated above with regard to claim 1,

a) mere disclosure in Eldridge et al. that tokens include URL information does not amount to the claimed "network path bookmark information" that comprises "user-select bookmark address for quick retrieval in a browser application";

b) mere disclosure in Eldridge et al. that tokens can be transferred between people and to a networked-computer using conventional web browser software does not amount to the specific claim language of the server computer being adapted to receive the network path bookmark information from the client computer, and a mobile device connected to the server computer to request the bookmark name;

c) mere disclosure in Ryu et al. that there is some sort of a predefined time interval for updating the URL web contents (in a gateway system based on the TTL, expire time, and last modification time of the URLs) does not amount to the claimed "means for determining the network path bookmark information from predetermined directory repeatably in a predefined time interval."

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Eldridge et al. and Ryu et al. neither teach nor suggest all of the features recited in claim 20. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 70006557-2


App. Ser. No.: 09/922,463

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2005

By



Timothy B. Kang

Registration No.: 46,423

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.

8221 Old Courthouse Road

Suite 104

Vienna, VA 22182

(703) 652-3817

(703) 880-5270 (facsimile)